

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/691,928

Applicant(s)

GOLDSTEIN ET AL.

Examiner

Nathan W. Schlientz

Art Unit

1616

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Nathan W. Schlientz.(3) William F. Smith, Registration 58,346.(2) Johann Richter.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 25 April 2007.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference

c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.

If Yes, brief description: ____.

Claim(s) discussed: N/A.

Identification of prior art discussed: US Patent Application Publication 2003/0232086 and No. US Patents 5,219,877 and 6,075,056.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The substance of the Official Action mailed 4 December 2006 was discussed. The rejections under 35 USC 112 were discussed.

The rejection over 2003/0232086 was agreed to be overcome by the Declaration under 1.131.

US 5,219,877 (Shah) was discussed with regard to Shah disclosing the use of medium potency steroidal compounds.

The question of whether the hydrocortisone valerate gel is a medium or low-medium steroid was discussed.

The Declaration under 35 USC 1.132 was discussed with regard to experimental comparison of the invention to the closest prior art.